

Historic, Archive Document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

Selected Speeches and News Releases

June 1 - June 8, 1989

IN THIS ISSUE:

Statement—

Prepared for delivery by Jack C. Parnell, Deputy Secretary, United States Department of Agriculture before the Committee on Labor and Human Resources, U.S. Senate, June 6.

News Releases—

States to Share in National Forest Receipts

Yeutter Names Team for Trade Mission to Egypt and North Yemen

Four Named to Agricultural Science Hall of Fame

USDA Releases Cost of Food at Home for April

USDA Revises Regulations for the National Poultry Improvement Plan

Yeutter Announced Additional Drought Assistance: CRP Opened for Haying and Grazing

U.S., Canada Release Support Levels for Grains Under Free Trade Agreement

25th Anniversary of U.S. Wilderness System Celebrated

USDA Protects 13 New Plant Varieties

Ag Deans Report Strong Demand for Grads

Grain Reserve Storage/Release Levels Set for 1989 Feed Grains, Wheat

Background—

U.S. Department of Agriculture 1989 Drought Relief Measures

Statement

U.S. Department of Agriculture • Office of Information

Prepared for delivery by Jack C. Parnell, Deputy Secretary, United States Department of Agriculture before the Committee on Labor and Human Resources, U.S. Senate, June 6.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I welcome the opportunity to appear before you today to discuss S. 722 entitled the "Food Safety Amendments of 1989."

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) takes seriously its obligation to the American people for the safety of foods consumed. We believe that Americans have the right to a safe, wholesome, abundant and affordable food supply.

As the department with responsibilities for many aspects of the production, manufacture, marketing and distribution of food, we have a role to play.

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has the authority for determining the safety of agricultural chemicals and setting tolerances for their use, while the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) monitors residues for all foods with the exception of meat and poultry.

The USDA has the regulatory authority for the safety of meat and poultry products. Our charge is to apply and enforce the safe application of pesticides and other chemicals for plants and food-producing animals. We rely on the judgment and scientific assessments of the EPA and the FDA to determine regulatory limits for chemical use in food production and marketing.

The USDA accepts the shared responsibility for the safety of the food supply and for the public's confidence. The predominance of scientific evidence based on actual residue surveys suggest that our food supply is absolutely safe.

We agree that any pesticide that is clearly scientifically-proven unsafe should not be on the market. However, the judicious use of chemical tools is a major contributor to an abundant, affordable and high quality food supply.

A point that must not be lost in our reaction to the current concerns about agricultural chemicals was well stated in the recently released

report of the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) entitled, “Diet and Health—Implications for Reducing Chronic Disease.”

The fact that Americans are living longer “suggests that our society as a whole is not facing a health crisis posed by environmental agents.” The NAS Committee, in making their recommendation to consume five or more servings of fruits and vegetables each day, took into account the fact that this could potentially increase consumption of certain chemical residues, if present.

The expert body’s conclusion was that the benefits from consuming large quantities of fruits and vegetables exceed any potential increased risks.

If pesticide use was eliminated or greatly reduced without practical alternatives, production losses would occur and the cost of agricultural production and marketing would dramatically increase. This would translate to decreased food availability and higher prices for consumers.

The increased food prices could severely affect lower economic status populations and could repress the economic well being of the very individuals our government works so hard to support.

The USDA approves of the elimination of the Delaney Clause or the “zero risk” requirement. The NAS in their 1987 report entitled, “The Delaney Paradox”, recognized that zero risk does not exist. Negligible risk must be recognized and operationally defined by good science.

The current method for EPA’s determination of risk is generally based on multiple worst case assumptions, ending up with a truly conservative projection. This bill exacerbates this worst case risk assessment.

Risk assessment is a scientific tool intended to estimate the significance of a potential hazard but not to definitively indicate real dietary risk or to predict deaths caused from cancer.

The USDA endorses the proper use of risk assessment as well as the general movement toward reduced and strategic use of agricultural chemicals. This philosophy undergirds the commendable practices of integrated pest management (IPM) and low input sustainable agriculture (LISA) programs. The USDA supports these concepts but must emphatically state that we do not include in that support the abandonment of agricultural chemical use.

These technologies employ the use of modest but adequate amounts of chemicals in addition to good production management practices. This policy is a sound one for plant and animal production, as well as for the environment.

Inherent in these good management practices is the understanding that agricultural chemicals do have significant benefits. This is another point on which the USDA must differ with the pending legislation. Let me explain by use of example. Consider the case of an agricultural chemical whose recognized worst case risk assessment may exceed the one in one million criterion. However, the elimination of the use of this chemical would permit the exclusive application of products which fit within the requirement for negligible cancer risk but may pose other increased risks to the environment.

For instance, it may be that the example chemical was not toxic to plants, would not accumulate in the soil and was not harmful to aquatic life. It would be possible that the replacement chemicals could present a greater risk to human health overall but would be acceptable as defined by this bill as it is currently drafted.

The benefits of agricultural chemical use, in contrast to common perception, do not accrue only to farmers and chemical companies. The benefits accrue to all consumers because well managed chemical use helps to assure an adequate, wholesome and affordable food supply.

The EPA is currently permitted under their regulations to consider the benefits in evaluating chemicals. The elimination of this ability in EPA's determinations of regulatory limits for agricultural chemicals would severely affect the abundance and wholesomeness of the food supply and would negatively impact all consumers. The reasoned and flexible approach in considering risk/benefit is both useful and necessary. The USDA strongly supports scientific risk/benefit balancing.

Another aspect of the bill as currently written which the department finds untenable is the requirement of the aggregate negligible risk standard. This concept would be filtered into the determination of a negligible risk level in establishing tolerances to be phased in over a six-year period. By the end of the sixth year, this stringent risk standard would mandate that the combined risk from all pesticides registered and available for use on a particular crop would, in total, be negligible.

Additionally, this bill would require that dietary exposure to the chemical be calculated based upon the maximum amount of residue that could be expected to occur if the instructions for use of the pesticide are followed. This would greatly exaggerate real exposures. If for little more reason than their expense, chemicals are used in agricultural production with prudence.

Risk assessments should be based on actual residue data, actual

exposure data and realistic toxicological and metabolic data. We must encourage the responsible use of the scientific information in risk assessment. The appearance of aggregate risk seems to be a practical approach to ensure the public health. However, in practice, aggregate risk assumes the sum total of worst case scenarios, thereby distorting the risk assessment further from reality; and potentially ignores important research data.

The department believes that requirements for approval of new agricultural chemicals should not include unrealistic requests for data, unreasonable time tables or inordinate controls. Such requirements stifle innovations in the development of new agricultural chemicals that could benefit health.

We also see a problem with respect to the proposed amendment for the definition of "pesticide chemical." Under the bill, pesticide chemicals would include those substances used as a pesticide which is or has been used in the production, storage or transportation of processed foods and the bill removes the use of such pesticides in processed food from the definition of "food additives," which are regulated under Section 409 of the Federal Food Drug and Cosmetic (FFD&C) Act.

Several acts which the USDA administers, namely the Federal Meat Inspection Act, the Poultry Products Inspection Act and the Egg Products Inspection Act, contain adulteration provisions which refer directly to the current provisions on pesticide chemicals and food additives in the FFD&C Act.

Unless the USDA acts are also amended, only raw agricultural commodities will be deemed adulterated if they contain a pesticide chemical which is unsafe under Section 408 of the FFD&C Act. We suggest that the definition of these different statutes be reconciled.

The proposal to include inert (non-active) ingredients in the tolerance determination, if the inert ingredients were not categorized as "Generally Recognized As Safe" (GRAS), would greatly increase the scope of regulation. Methods for detecting the inert compounds in addition to the active ingredients would have to be developed before this application became practical. Many inert compounds, by their nature, are not amenable to currently available analytical techniques.

Finally, it must be mentioned that the bill refers only to the administrator of the EPA and to the secretary of health and human services, suggesting that EPA and FDA are alone responsible for monitoring pesticide residues in the food supply. The secretary of

agriculture is responsible for the monitoring and surveillance for those pesticide chemicals which may be in meat or poultry products, for which there is an exceptionally active and successful control program.

Despite our concerns, there are some elements of the bill which we can support— namely, the elimination of the zero risk requirement for processed foods, which is a positive step forward. However, we must oppose the bill as currently drafted due to its potent impacts. The USDA finds the cost, in terms of potential adverse effects on our food supply, of the unreasonable definition and methods for determining negligible risk in this bill unsupportable.

Certainly, if there is sufficient reason to believe that an existing tolerance for an approved chemical should be reevaluated, the department believes that there should be a mechanism in place for that review to occur in the interest of protecting the public health. However, to make these proposed changes based on the erroneous assumption that regulatory agencies lack the mechanism to suspend the use of select chemicals on an emergency basis is an inappropriate action. The EPA, the FDA and regulatory agencies under the USDA umbrella certainly have the capability to act swiftly when there is sufficient scientific basis to do so.

Our common goal is to provide a safe, abundant and affordable food supply for all Americans. But, in order to do so, we must act and react rationally.

The public fear of cancer from consuming the products of American agriculture is an emotional one and has no foundation in fact. We believe that the public is best served by reasoned and timely regulatory action, greater collaboration by responsible agencies and a greater outreach to better communicate food safety as controlled by good science.

#

News Releases

U.S. Department of Agriculture • Office of Information

STATES TO SHARE IN NATIONAL FOREST RECEIPTS

WASHINGTON, June 1—An estimated \$346 million will be shared by 43 states and Puerto Rico as their portions of 1989 National Forest System receipts, according to estimates released today by the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Forest Service Chief F. Dale Robertson said 25 percent of the total 1989 receipts will be returned to states in which National Forest System lands are located. Revenues are collected for the use of these 191 million acres of national forests, national grasslands, and land utilization projects for timber sales, grazing, recreation, minerals, and land uses. The states are required by law to use their share of the receipts for public schools and roads.

Robertson said making advance estimates of the state payments helps local budget planners complete their work. He said the final payments will be based on actual receipts collected and may vary from the estimates announced today.

According to Robertson, interim payments representing 75 percent of the estimated total state shares of national forest receipts will be made in September. The balance will be paid in December, when final figures on the revenue collected during fiscal year 1989 are available. The counties in some of the states also share in the national grassland and land utilization project receipts which are based on calendar year 1989 revenues and will be paid on or about March 1, 1990.

States received more than \$318 million as their share of 1988 national forest revenues, and participating counties received over \$7 million from revenue from national grassland and land utilization projects. State by state, the estimated 1989 payments are:

State	National Forests	National Grasslands and Land Utilization Projects
	<i>(dollars)</i>	<i>(dollars)</i>
ALABAMA	1,350,250.02	
ALASKA	5,920,425.01	
ARIZONA	8,421,794.64	
ARKANSAS	4,036,837.23	375.00
CALIFORNIA	59,497,556.72	875.00
COLORADO	2,768,352.34	281,860.15
FLORIDA	2,332,750.02	108,750.00
GEORGIA	709,750.02	
IDAHO	10,928,406.82	2,818.18
ILLINOIS	66,089.94	
INDIANA	73,498.82	
KANSAS		1,253,961.25
KENTUCKY	462,135.71	107,000.00
LOUISIANA	2,727,670.27	
MAINE	38,666.08	
MARYLAND		5,000.00
MICHIGAN	1,877,840.06	46,375.00
MINNESOTA	1,930,764.12	
MISSISSIPPI	4,344,898.30	
MISSOURI	2,225,675.07	640.50
MONTANA	7,095,613.98	
NEBRASKA	32,900.00	10,150.00
NEVADA	360,827.89	
NEW HAMPSHIRE	562,228.62	
NEW MEXICO	2,469,795.15	12,835.25
NEW YORK	20,359.11	
NORTH CAROLINA	568,023.47	
NORTH DAKOTA	63.46	2,582,994.58
OHIO	199,828.43	238.21
OKLAHOMA	542,815.23	989,973.50
OREGON	154,522,558.67	5,250.00
PENNSYLVANIA	2,716,264.48	3,375.00
SOUTH CAROLINA	2,006,615.77	
SOUTH DAKOTA	1,175,475.93	86,041.02
TENNESSEE	370,906.33	

TEXAS	2,015,509.77	58,148.00
UTAH	1,070,617.97	
VERMONT	140,758.89	
VIRGINIA	351,089.40	
WASHINGTON	49,157,375.63	
WEST VIRGINIA	799,899.33	
WISCONSIN	636,082.99	
WYOMING	1,208,053.26	3,555,200.00
PUERTO RICO	16,758.40	
Total	\$337,753,783.35	\$9,111,860.64

Marty Longan (202) 475-3777

#

**YEUTTER NAMES TEAM FOR TRADE MISSION TO EGYPT
AND NORTH YEMEN**

WASHINGTON, June 1—Secretary of Agriculture Clayton Yeutter today appointed eight private-sector and government officials to meet with their counterparts in Egypt and North Yemen to discuss agricultural trade prospects and other mutual agricultural interests.

The agricultural mission, scheduled for June 9-23, is one of a series administered cooperatively by the U.S. Departments of Agriculture and State, and the U.S. Agency for International Development.

Ronnie G. Gollehon, president, Agricultural Cooperative Development International, will lead the mission. Gollehon was appointed earlier.

Trade mission members are: Franklin D. Lee, agricultural counselor-designate (Cairo), Foreign Agricultural Service, USDA, who will serve as the mission coordinator; Rex B. Schultz, director of overseas training, Agricultural Cooperative Development International, who will serve as the mission's executive secretary.

Also, Nels J. Ackerson, trade and investment counselor, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives; Frank M. Crane, former chairman of the board, American Feed Industry Association; Owen Cylke, deputy assistant administrator, Bureau of Food for Peace and Voluntary Assistance, U.S. Agency for International Development; Paul B. Green, marketing and trade policy advisor, Millers' National Federation; Olaf N. Otto, trade and commercial officer, Office of Regional Affairs, Near

Eastern and South Asian Affairs, Department of State; and Sumner I. Strashun, food processing analyst, Food Plant Engineering, Inc.

Mission representatives were chosen for their knowledge of U.S. export programs, as well as food needs, trade potential and economy of Egypt and Yemen. After completion of the mission, the representatives will report their findings and recommendations to the President and Congress.

Congress authorized the missions program in December 1987 to encourage greater U.S. private sector and foreign country participation in U.S. agricultural trade and development activities. The program was announced by USDA in January 1988. To date, missions to nine countries have been completed, and a mission to Jamaica and Ecuador is scheduled for this fall.

For more information, contact Wayne W. Sharp, U.S. Coordinator, Agricultural Trade and Development Missions Program, Room 3058-S, USDA, FAS, Washington, D.C. 20250-1000; telephone (202) 382-0368.

Sally Klusaritz (202) 447-3448

#

FOUR NAMED TO AGRICULTURAL SCIENCE HALL OF FAME

WASHINGTON, June 2—Four retired U.S. Department of Agriculture scientists whose careers brought them worldwide recognition have been named to the Hall of Fame of USDA's Agricultural Research Service.

All four scientists served with ARS, the principal science agency at USDA. Their induction into the "Hall of Fame" will be Tuesday evening, June 6, in ceremonies here at the U.S. National Arboretum. ARS operates the arboretum.

"Landmark research by each of these scientists has advanced agriculture both at home and abroad," said ARS administrator R. Dean Plowman. "Each is a leader in his field and has an international reputation for scientific excellence. And, although retired from federal service, each continues to be an active and vital part of the scientific community."

The four scientists are:

* Theodore O. Diener, retired plant pathologist and research leader, Microbiology and Plant Pathology Research Laboratory, Beltsville, Md.;

* Douglas R. Dewey, retired plant geneticist and research leader, Forage and Range Research Unit, Logan, Utah;

* Karl Norris, retired agricultural engineer and research leader, Instrumentation Research Laboratory, Beltsville, Md.; and

* John F. Sullivan, retired chemical engineer and research leader, Eastern Regional Research Center, Philadelphia, Pa.

Theodor O. Diener made scientific history when he discovered viroids, the smallest known agent of infectious disease in any organism. Viroids are about 1/80 the size of a virus and lack the protein coating common to viruses. They have been identified by Diener and others as causing several viral-like plant diseases that had baffled scientists for years.

Diener's research on viroids, which compares with the discovery of bacteria in the late 1800's and the discovery of viruses in the first half of the 20th century, has opened whole new avenues of research on some of the most serious diseases affecting plants, animals and humans.

Diener was elected to the National Academy of Sciences in 1977. In 1987, he received the international Wolf Prize in Agriculture and the National Medal of Science. Retired from ARS since 1988, he is now a professor of botany at the University of Maryland and leader of a viroid research team in the University's Center for Agricultural Biotechnology.

Douglas R. Dewey is internationally acclaimed for his research to improve forage grasses and grazing lands both in the U.S. and abroad. The world's leading authority on the genetics of wheatgrasses, wildryes and related wild species within the Triticeae tribe of grasses, his work has enabled geneticists and breeders to systematically transfer genes among these perennials and from wild Triticeae grasses to their cultivated relatives—wheat, barley and rye.

He also assembled the world's largest and most diverse collection of perennial Triticeae grasses from which he personally developed over 250 hybrid combinations and 60 potential new species.

Although officially retired from ARS since 1984, Dewey continues to conduct research important to the agency's forage and range improvement programs and to address scientific meetings and workshops around the world. Also, he still serves as curator of the Triticeae collection and recently published a major reclassification of Triticeae perennials.

Karl Norris conceived and developed a new field of instrument technology using the infrared part of the spectrum to evaluate the quality of agricultural products.

Following some early research on egg candling (transmitting light

through eggs to check their quality), Norris found that certain infrared wavelengths would pass through agricultural products in varying degrees depending on the product and its internal condition. Putting his discovery to work, he devised hand-held instruments that beamed infrared rays into fruits and vegetables to evaluate their internal health, color and ripeness. Later, he designed and built the first infrared instrument to measure the moisture, protein and oil content of cereal grains and soybeans.

More than 1500 instruments based on Norris' prototype have been manufactured by several U.S. companies for testing grain in the U.S., Canada and Europe.

In 1978, Norris received the international Alexander von Humboldt award for his pioneering research on grain testing with infrared waves. Retired from ARS since mid-1988, he continues to work with industry and government organizations both in the U.S. and abroad as a consultant on infrared instrumentation to evaluate the quality of agricultural products.

John F. Sullivan has been a major force in the advancement of food processing and storage technologies. As a senior member of the ARS research team that developed instant potato flakes, he helped bring about a new era in high-quality, low-weight foods with a long shelf life. His work helped revitalize the entire potato industry as well. Today, potato flakes are the retail market's leading form of dried mashed potatoes used as a food ingredient.

Sullivan also co-developed the "explosion puffing" method of producing dried fruits and vegetables for use in cereals and instant soups. Compared to previous industry methods for dehydrating fruits and vegetables, explosion puffing improves product quality while reducing waste, energy consumption and pollution.

Sullivan officially retired from ARS in 1985 but has been re-employed by the agency to spread the word on explosion-puffing technology—especially to other countries. He is also working with agency scientists on the mathematical simulation of a complete food processing system.

Steve Miller (301) 344-3520

#

USDA RELEASES COST OF FOOD AT HOME FOR APRIL

WASHINGTON, June 2—Here is the U.S. Department of Agriculture’s monthly update of the weekly cost of food at home for April 1989:

Cost of food at home for a week in April 1989

	-----Food plans-----			
	(In Dollars)			
	Thrifty	Low-cost	Moderate cost	Liberal
Families:				
Family of 2				
(20-50 years)	44.40	56.00	69.20	85.90
Family of 2				
(51 years and over)	42.00	53.70	66.30	79.50
Family of 4 with				
preschool children	64.60	80.40	98.50	120.80
Family of 4 with elemen-				
tary schoolchildren	74.10	94.50	118.30	142.50
Individuals in				
four-person families:				
Children:				
1-2 years	11.60	14.10	16.50	19.90
3-5 years	12.60	15.40	19.10	22.80
6-8 years	15.40	20.40	25.50	29.80
9-11 years	18.30	23.20	29.90	34.60
Females:				
12-19 years	19.00	22.80	27.70	33.50
20-50 years	19.20	23.80	29.00	37.10
51 and over	18.90	23.10	28.60	34.20
Males:				
12-14 years	19.20	26.30	32.90	38.50
15-19 years	19.90	27.20	33.80	39.20
20-50 years	21.20	27.10	33.90	41.00
51 and over	19.30	25.70	31.70	38.10

USDA's Human Nutrition Information Service computes the cost of food at home for four food plans—thrifty, low-cost, moderate-cost, and liberal.

Dr. James T. Heimbach, acting administrator of HNIS, said the plans consist of foods that provide well-balanced meals and snacks for a week.

In computing the costs, USDA assumes all food is bought at the store and prepared at home. Costs do not include alcoholic beverages, pet food, soap, cigarettes, paper goods, and other nonfood items bought at the store.

“USDA costs are only guides to spending,” Heimbach said. “Families may spend more or less, depending on such factors as where they buy their food, how carefully they plan and buy, whether some food is produced at home, what foods the family likes, and how much food is prepared at home.

“Most families will find the moderate-cost or low-cost plan suitable,” he said. “The thrifty plan, which USDA uses to set the coupon allotment in the food stamp program, is for families who have tighter budgets. Families with unlimited resources might use the liberal plan.”

To use the chart to estimate your family's food costs:

—For members eating all meals at home—or carried from home—use the amounts shown in the chart.

—For members eating some meals out, deduct 5 percent from the amount shown for each meal not eaten at home. Thus, for a person eating lunch out 5 days a week, subtract 25 percent, or one-fourth the cost shown.

—For guests, add 5 percent of the amount shown for the proper age group for each meal.

Costs in the second part of the chart are for individuals in fourperson families. If your family has more or less than four, total the “individual” figures and make these adjustments, because larger families tend to buy and use food more economically than smaller ones:

—For a one-person family, add 20 percent.

—For a two-person family, add 10 percent.

—For a three-person family, add 5 percent.

—For a five or six-person family, subtract 5 percent.

—For a family of seven or more, subtract 10 percent.

Details of the four family food plans are available from the Nutrition Education Division, HNIS, USDA, Federal Building, Hyattsville, Md. 20782.

Johna Pierce (301) 436-8617

#

USDA REVISES REGULATIONS FOR THE NATIONAL POULTRY IMPROVEMENT PLAN

WASHINGTON, June 2—The U.S. Department of Agriculture is expanding the National Poultry Improvement Plan (NPIP) to help reduce the transmission of diseases, such as salmonella infections, in eggs and poultry products.

Larry B. Slagle, acting administrator for USDA's Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, said the changes would expand sanitation requirements for breeding flocks and hatcheries supplying chicks and poults to producers of poultry and eggs. Changes were made to increase the effectiveness of the monitoring and testing procedures to keep them current with the latest improvements in poultry disease technology.

“Up to now, the plan placed major emphasis on *Salmonella pullorum* and *Salmonella gallinarum*, which cause the poultry diseases of pullorum and fowl typhoid,” said Slagle. “Problems with these poultry diseases prompted producers to start NPIP in the early 1930's.”

The revised program requires surveillance for Group D *Salmonella* in egg-type breeding flocks, including *S. pullorum* and *S. gallinarum*, as well as *S. enteritidis*, which has been implicated in some cases of food contamination that have caused salmonella infections in humans. Egg-type breeding flock owners would have to test and culture for the presence of these salmonella. Certain feed processing and sanitation procedures are also requirements included in the revised program.

“The changes also include a new “U.S. Sanitation-Monitored, Turkeys” program to help reduce food-borne diseases in the turkey industry,” said Slagle.

The NPIP, administered by APHIS, is a voluntary federal-state-industry program for the improvement of poultry breeding stock and hatchery products. The objectives of this voluntary program are achieved primarily through the prevention and control of certain poultry diseases.

Marlene Stinson (301) 436-7255

#

YEUTTER ANNOUNCED ADDITIONAL DROUGHT ASSISTANCE: CRP OPENED FOR HAYING AND GRAZING

WASHINGTON, June 2—Secretary of Agriculture Clayton Yeutter today announced his intent to permit haying and grazing of Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) under carefully prescribed conditions. This action is being taken because of the impact of drought conditions on the availability of livestock feed in several parts of the Midwest.

“Unfortunately, the 1988 drought has continued into 1989 in some areas of the central United States, and this has drastically depleted supplies of forage,” Yeutter said. “Livestock producers have exhausted stocks of hay that were carried into the winter, and they are now faced with another dry spring. So they’re out of hay and short of grass.”

“As much as we would prefer not to hay or graze CRP lands, we simply cannot sit idly by while cow herds are liquidated,” Yeutter added. “A cow that is slaughtered cannot be fully replaced in a breeding herd for two or three years.”

“At the same time,” he asserted, “we must respond to this emergency in a cautious, prudent way so that we sustain the environmental protections that are the heart of the CRP. We believe the program we are outlining today will do that.”

In today’s announcement, Yeutter declared that qualifying farmers and ranchers in counties where a livestock emergency has been determined to exist are eligible to apply for haying and grazing on CRP lands under the following conditions:

- All determinations will be on a county-by-county basis;
 - There will be a 50 percent offset in CRP payments for the next contract year;
 - At least 25 percent of the field must be left undisturbed for wildlife cover;
 - There will be no donation of haying and grazing privileges in exchange for waiver of payment reductions:
 - Compliance spot checks will be expanded;
 - Any stand failures must be re-established at owner expense.
- Vegetative cover specifications in the CRP contract will not be waived due to drought conditions;
- There will be no haying or grazing on CRP stands planted after July 1, 1987;

- Only one cutting of hay will be permitted;
- There will be no haying after July 15;
- Hayed acres must have at least 3 inches of stubble remaining;
- There will be no grazing except as approved by the Soil Conservation Service on a case-by-case basis after visual inspection;
- Each county grazing period and stocking rate will be determined by the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service county committee in consultation with SCS, but there will be no grazing after Aug. 1; and
- No assistance will be provided for livestock facilities such as fences or watering equipment on CRP acres.

State and county ASCS and SCS personnel have been directed to implement the program in an environmentally sensitive manner. “Our objective is to help livestock producers through this difficult period while also preserving the stands of grass and wildlife that nest there. We are confident we can do so,” Yeutter noted.

“Fortunately, rains continue to fall in the Midwest and Great Plains states, and they will benefit both pastureland and spring crops,” Yeutter said. “The situation has improved substantially but significant drought pockets still remain.”

Today’s action follow a fact-finding tour of Iowa growing areas on May 30 by Yeutter, Governor Terry Branstad and the entire Iowa Congressional delegation, and earlier visits to both Nebraska and Kansas.

Secretary Yeutter had previously announced the following droughtrelief measures: state-wide haying and grazing on annually idled acres, the relaxation of USDA’s forage sales policy on this land, emergency feed programs, and haying on FmHA inventory lands. He had also established an intradepartmental drought task force headed by Under Secretary for International Affairs and Commodity Programs Richard T. Crowder.

Under the previously announced programs as of June 2, haying and grazing of annually idled acres in the five growing months was underway in 573 counties in 16 states; haying and grazing of these lands in the seven nongrowing months was underway in all counties in 24 states; 178 counties in six states had qualified for the emergency feed program; and 160 counties in five states had qualified for the emergency feed assistance program.

Kelly Shipp (202) 447-4623

#

**U.S., CANADA RELEASE SUPPORT LEVELS FOR GRAINS
UNDER FREE TRADE AGREEMENT**

WASHINGTON, June 5—The United States and Canada today released the producer support levels for wheat, barley and oats calculated under the formulation specified in the U.S.-Canada Free Trade Agreement. The support levels are used as a benchmark to determine whether Canadian import licensing restrictions on certain grains and products will be eliminated.

The support levels are calculated in terms of the percent of producers' income provided by government support for each type of grain. The levels are:

	WHEAT	BARLEY	OATS
United States	61.62 %	72.49 %	8.74 %
Canada	46.28 %	50.23 %	11.09 %

Under the terms of the agreement, Canada will remove its requirement for import licenses for wheat, barley and oats when U.S. support levels for these products are equal to or less than those of Canada. Since the U.S. support level for oats is less than Canada's, Canada will no longer require import licenses for oats and oat products.

Under the FTA, both countries reserve the right to impose or reimpose import restrictions on particular grains if imports increase significantly as a result of a substantial change in either country's support program for that grain.

Sally Klusaritz, (202) 447-3448.

#

**25TH ANNIVERSARY OF U.S. WILDERNESS SYSTEM
CELEBRATED**

WASHINGTON, June 6—Federal agencies responsible for managing U.S. wilderness areas are joining private organizations in celebrating the 25th anniversary of the establishment of the National Wilderness Preservation System.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture's Forest Service and the U.S. Department of the Interior's National Park Service, Fish and Wildlife Service and Bureau of Land Management manage the 142,000 square miles of wilderness comprising the system—an area nearly the size of Montana.

These four federal agencies and private environmental organizations including The Wilderness Society, the Sierra Club and the Izaak Walton League will mark the anniversary with activities around the country this summer and fall. Events include national symposia and seminars, concerts, educational programs, and dedications of newly-established wilderness areas.

Forest Service Chief F. Dale Robertson said the aim of the activities is to increase public awareness and appreciation of the wilderness system. "Many activities are designed to educate people about the sensitive nature of wilderness," Robertson said, "and how each person can play an important role in protecting the wilderness heritage. Wilderness messages, such as 'Leave No Trace' camping, will also be highlighted."

With the passage of the the Wilderness Act in 1964, the United States established the world's first national wilderness preservation system by setting aside 9.1 million acres of national forest land. Today, the system has grown to almost 91 million acres in 44 states; 38.5 million acres of wilderness have been set aside in national parks, 32.5 million acres in national forests, 19.3 million acres in national wildlife refuges, and 0.5 million acres in BLM land holdings.

BLM is currently reviewing lands under its administration for possible recommendation to the president that additional tracts be added to the system.

The 474 individual wilderness areas range in size from the huge 8.7-million-acre Wrangell-St. Elias National Park in Alaska to the 5-acre Oregon Islands Wilderness off the coast of Oregon. The largest in the lower 48 states is the Frank Church-River of No Return Wilderness located in national forests in Idaho.

The Wilderness Act directs that wilderness areas be managed to "secure for the American people . . . and future generations the benefits of an enduring resource of wilderness . . . unimpaired for future use and enjoyment." It says the areas shall be "devoted to the public purposes of recreation, scenic, scientific, educational, conservation and historical use."

Recreational visitors to wilderness areas enjoy hiking, backpacking, horseback riding, hunting, fishing, sightseeing, cross country skiing and nature study. With few exceptions, such as special provisions in Alaska, the use of motor vehicles, motorized equipment, motorboats, aircraft and other power-operated machinery is restricted in wilderness areas.

Richard Lindeborg (202) 447-4211

#

USDA PROTECTS 13 NEW PLANT VARIETIES

WASHINGTON, June 6—The U.S. Department of Agriculture has issued certificates of protection to developers of 13 new varieties of seed-reproduced plants, including bean, corn, cowpea, lettuce, soybean, and wheat.

Kenneth H. Evans, an official with USDA's Agricultural Marketing Service, said developers of the new varieties will have the exclusive right to reproduce, sell, import, and export their products in the United States for 18 years. Certificates of protection are granted after a review of the breeders' records and claims that each new variety is novel, uniform, and stable.

The following varieties have been issued certificates of protection:

- the Venture variety of garden bean, developed by the Rogers Brothers Seed Co., Boise, Idaho;
- the NS501 and OQ603 varieties of corn, developed by United AgriSeeds Inc., Champaign, Ill.;
- the CT Pinkeye Purplehull variety of cowpea, developed by the C.T. Smith Co., Pleasanton, Texas;
- the Green Bowl variety of lettuce, developed by the Asgrow Seed Co., Kalamazoo, Mich.;
- the Primavera variety of lettuce, developed by Genecorp Technology, Salinas, Calif.;
- the Sharkey variety of soybean, developed by the Mississippi Agricultural and Forestry Experiment Station, Mississippi State, Miss.;
- the CX458 and CX298 varieties of soybean, developed by DeKalb-Pfizer Genetics, DeKalb, Ill.;
- the AP 1650 and AP 1989 varieties of soybean, developed by Nickerson American Plant Breeders Inc., Mission, Kans.;
- the Dynasty variety of wheat, developed by the Ohio State

University, Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center, Wooster, Ohio;

—the Imperial variety of durum wheat, developed by Western Plant Breeders Inc., Tempe, Ariz.

Certificates of protection for the Sharkey soybean variety, the Dynasty wheat variety, and the Imperial durum wheat variety are being issued to be sold by variety name only as a class of certified seed, and to conform to the number of generations specified by the owner.

The plant variety protection program is administered by AMS and provides marketing protection to developers of new and distinctive seed-reproduced plants ranging from farm crops to flowers.

Carolyn Coutts (202) 447-8998

#

AG DEANS REPORT STRONG DEMAND FOR GRADS

WASHINGTON—The nation's colleges of agriculture have good news for students: there are more jobs than there are graduates.

So said deans from seven agricultural universities and colleges nationwide, who were interviewed recently by Purdue University's School of Agriculture to get their assessment of the job market for this year's class of agriculture graduates.

Although the informal telephone survey by Purdue's agricultural communication service did show a decrease again this year in the number of agricultural graduates, it also showed more companies are increasing recruitment activities on campus and freshmen enrolled in agricultural studies are on the upswing.

J. Patrick Jordan, administrator of the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Cooperative States Research Service, said that four of the schools contacted showed an increase in their freshmen class over last year. The College of Agriculture at Colorado State University in Fort Collins, Colo., led the way with an increase of 25 percent, said Jordan.

"It is a more competitive market for graduates," said Allan D. Goecker, assistant dean of agriculture and the chief agricultural placement official at Purdue University's School of Agriculture in West Lafayette, Ind. "Both employers and students are making earlier commitments this year."

Half of the 1,721 undergraduates in the School of Agriculture are

enrolled in three departments—agricultural economics, horticulture, and forestry and natural resources.

Last year the school graduated 355 and expects to graduate 365 seniors this year, Goecker added.

Goecker said the agricultural enrollments began a slow climb a year ago when 352 freshmen enrolled in the 42 agricultural curricula. This fall 455 freshmen will account for an 16 percent increase, he said.

Last winter twice as many recruiters visited the Purdue campus as two years ago. In October, 40 corporate recruiters attended Purdue's annual Agriculture Career Day, one-third more than a year ago.

Starting salaries range from \$18,000 to \$30,000, annually, Goecker said, with the average just over \$20,000. The 1988 graduates averaged \$20,873 about 8.6 percent higher than 1987.

Goecker is a member of a U.S. Department of Agriculture committee on manpower needs that forecast an annual shortage of 4,000 food and agricultural science graduates extending into the 1990s.

Marvin J. Cepica, associate dean for resident instruction at Texas Tech in Lubbock, said employers are concerned about the shortage of agriculture graduates, and some have increased their support for agricultural colleges.

"We have really increased our internship figures," Cepica said. "Many result in a job after graduation, either with that company or with a related industry."

He said food technology seniors can command salaries ranging from \$25,000 to \$30,000 annually, with an average starting salary for all agricultural graduates "somewhere between \$19,000 and \$20,000."

William R. Thomas, dean of the College of Agriculture at Colorado State University in Fort Collins, is concerned as well about the shortage of agriculture graduates. However, Thomas said the overall enrollment in the College of Agricultural Sciences is fairly steady, and the school does have 25 percent more freshmen than a year earlier.

The most popular agricultural program at Colorado State is equine science, Thomas said, which attracts a large proportion of women and out-ofstate students. The program, jointly offered by the Colleges of Agriculture and Veterinary Medicine, instructs some 300 students a year in equine reproduction, nutrition, management and health, he said.

The same is true at Mississippi State University in Mississippi State where Charles E. Lindley, dean of the College of Agriculture and Home

Economics, said there are plentiful employment opportunities, but not enough "good graduates."

Lindley said that interviewers are more selective, with salaries ranging from \$18,000 to \$27,000 annually. They average about \$21,000, he said, with the strongest demand for food science and marketing graduates.

Landscape architecture and agricultural economics are the two most popular programs with students, Lindley said. Also popular at Mississippi State is the agricultural operations management program, formerly called agricultural mechanization.

More employers are visiting the University of Florida's College of Agriculture in Gainesville this year, according to H. Evan Drummond, acting dean for resident instruction.

Hiring is on the increase in fruit and vegetable production, poultry and dairy science, and agronomy and soil science. Salary offers range from \$15,000 to \$30,000, with the average near \$20,000, Drummond said.

Popular areas of study with undergraduates at Florida are in the Food Science and Human Nutrition Department, Drummond said. A close second is the microbiology program, which counts 450 majors, most of whom are studying premedicine, preveterinary medicine, and predentistry, or planning to attend graduate schools.

Florida's agricultural enrollment, which fell from 1,400 to less than 700 students during the past decade, enjoyed a four percent increase to 690 students during the 1988-89 school year, Drummond said. He counted another 73 in the School of Forestry.

Charles M. Smallwood, dean of the School of Agricultural Sciences and Technology, California State University-Fresno, said that the school's agricultural enrollment held steady with about 1,200 agriculture students until 1983, then declined 25 percent during the next four years. In September, however, the freshman class increased five percent. The college consists of four agriculture departments plus home economics and industrial technology.

Smallwood said the largest enrollments are in agribusiness and animal science, but the faster growing majors are enology, which is the science or study of making wines; food science; and nutrition. However, he said there were 100 more jobs than the 303 graduates at Fresno last year.

Carl L. Pherson, associate dean for academic affairs at California State, said plant and food science graduates are getting salaries ranging from \$20,000 to \$28,000 a year, with the food science graduates "doing some better."

Pherson said the college is “under-enrolled in plant and food sciences. If you are willing to study and be competitive,” he said, “there are good opportunities waiting for you.”

At Cornell University in Ithaca, N.Y., the College of Agriculture’s associate dean and director of resident instruction, George B. Conneman, said he sees a “fairly favorable job market this spring” with more recruiters on campus than in recent years. He said that “firms related to agribusiness are competing” for graduates and that salaries are up at least as much as the rate of inflation.

Jim Oliver (317) 494-8400

Issued: June 7, 1989

#

GRAIN RESERVE STORAGE/RELEASE LEVELS SET FOR 1989 FEED GRAINS, WHEAT

WASHINGTON, June 7—The U.S. Department of Agriculture today announced that based on current projections of 1989/90 use for wheat and feed grains, the upper limits of the quantity of grain that may be stored in the farmer-owned grain reserve (FOR) for the 1989 crop years will be 650 million bushels of wheat and 1.4 billion bushels of feed grains.

It is anticipated that the FOR levels will not reach these quantities for either wheat or feed grains.

The reserve release levels for feed grains and wheat are the same as their established “target” prices for the 1989 wheat and feed grain marketing years.

By law, when supplies are abundant and market prices do not exceed 140 percent of the respective loan rates, and quantities fall below 300 million bushels for wheat and 450 million bushels for feed grains, the secretary of agriculture must take actions to encourage entry of grain into the FOR.

FOR release price levels for the 1989 marketing years for wheat and feed grains are:

Commodity	Marketing Year	Release Price (\$/bu.)
Wheat	June 1, 1989 - May 31, 1990	4.10
Barley	June 1, 1989 - May 31, 1990	2.43
Oats	June 1, 1989 - May 31, 1990	1.50
Corn	Sept. 1, 1989 - Aug. 31, 1990	2.84
Sorghum	Sept. 1, 1989 - Aug. 31, 1990	2.70

When the five-day moving average market price for a commodity reaches the reserve release price level, producers may repay their FOR loans, principal plus interest, with cash and not be subject to an early repayment penalty. Also, farmers may exchange commodity certificates for FOR grain at any time.

The current method of arriving at the national five-day moving adjusted average price for wheat uses the simple average of price quotes for three classes of wheat—Kansas City -1, hard red winter (HRW), ordinary protein; Minneapolis -1, dark northern spring (HRS), 14 percent protein; and Portland -1, white, ordinary protein.

Beginning tomorrow a new method will be used to determine the five-day average price for wheat during the 1989 wheat marketing year which uses all five classes of wheat. This new method will more closely approximate the value of the various classes of wheat in the FOR and will initially be based on data as of April 30, the most recent data available. The current quantity of each class in the FOR and the factors used in determining the five-day average price are as follows:

Wheat: Outstanding FOR loans - April 30, 1989

HRS	Durum	HRW	SRW	White	Total	
	-----		million	bushels	-----	
Quantity	111	35	116	2	67	331
	-----		factor	-----		
Weight	.3354	.1057	.3505	.0060	.2024	1.000

Robert Feist (202) 447-6789.

#

Background

U.S. Department of Agriculture • Office of Information

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE 1989 DROUGHT RELIEF MEASURES

Opening of CRP Acreage to Haying and Grazing—Secretary of Agriculture Clayton Yeutter today opened Conservation Reserve Program acreage to haying and grazing in counties where a livestock emergency has been determined to exist, under the following conditions: all determinations will be on a county-by-county basis; a 50-percent CRP payments offset for the next contract year; at least 25 percent of the field must be left in wildlife cover; no donation of haying and grazing privileges; all stand failures will be re-established at owner expense; no haying or grazing on CRP stands planted after July 1, 1987; one cutting of hay only; no haying after July 15; at least 3 inches of stubble remaining; approval of grazing on a case-by-case basis after visual inspection by Soil Conservation Service personnel; grazing period and stocking rates to be determined by Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service county committees in consultation with SCS, but no grazing after Aug. 1.

The following measures were announced May 24:

Haying and Grazing of ACR and CU Farm Program Acreage—To receive government price support benefits, deficiency payments and other benefits, producers of wheat, feed grains, upland and extra long staple cotton and rice must agree to reduce the production of these crops on their farms. This idled acreage generally is devoted to approved conserving uses to protect against erosion. On April 26, as a result of a natural disaster, Secretary Yeutter authorized on a county-by-county basis haying and grazing on Acreage Conservation Reserve (ACR) and Conservation Use (CU) acreage during restricted five-month periods individually established for all states. On May 24, the secretary authorized state-wide ACR and CU privileges for states with 75 percent of their counties designated eligible for these activities.

Relaxation of Forage Sales Policy on ACR and CU Acreage—Producers in eligible counties can sell ACR and CU forage at full market

prices instead of at harvest cost recovery. The following measures were announced April 26:

Emergency Feed Program—In 1989, qualifying producers in counties where a livestock emergency has been determined to exist are eligible to receive cost-sharing assistance for the purchase of livestock feed. Under this program, the Commodity Credit Corp. may share feed costs with producers who are forced to purchase more than normal amounts of feed (including hay) for their livestock. The CCC will provide assistance for up to one-half the cost of purchased feed, not to exceed 5 cents a pound feed grain equivalent, to cover the producer's feed need or feed loss, whichever is smaller.

Emergency Feed Assistance Program—In 1989, qualifying producers in counties in which a livestock emergency has been determined to exist are eligible to purchase grain from the CCC at 50 percent of the average market price in the county. CCC makes this grain available to the same producers who are also eligible to receive assistance under the Emergency Feed Program.

Zero/92 Payments—Under the 1989 wheat, feed grain, upland and extra long staple cotton, and rice programs, participating producers are eligible to receive price support benefits, deficiency payments and other benefits. Deficiency payments are made to producers in the event market prices do not exceed statutory target prices. These payments are based upon the acreage actually planted to these commodities. However, under the 1989 wheat and feed grain programs, producers may receive payments based upon the 1989 projected deficiency payment rates on acreage that is not planted to these crops if the land is devoted to approved conserving uses. The acreage for which a producer may receive these payments may not exceed 92 percent of the farm's wheat and feed grain crop acreage base, respectively. Producers who elect to exercise this option must have enrolled in the 1989 program by April 14, and must designate eligible 0/92 acreage.

Failed Acreage—Participating producers whose program crops fail may replant the failed acreage to another crop and earn any deficiency payments which would have been made with respect to the original crop. If the replanted crop is a program crop, program payments and benefits will not be made with respect to that second crop. Producers who wish to get failed acreage credit must apply in the county ASCS office within 15 days of the crop failure and prior to destruction of the evidence that a crop actually was planted. Determination of whether a crop has failed

will be made by the county ASCS committee. Producers also may designate this failed acreage as CU acreage under the 0/92 provisions of the wheat and feed grain programs and receive guaranteed payments in an amount equal to the projected deficiency payment rate.

Emergency Credit/FmHA Emergency Loan Program—The secretary of agriculture is authorized to designate a county as a natural disaster area when it is determined that farming, ranching, or aquaculture operations have been substantially impacted by a natural disaster. One of these criteria must be met: at least a 30-percent countywide reduction from normal dollar value of all crops; at least a 30-percent countywide reduction of a single crop; or qualifying losses suffered by one or more farmers who cannot get credit elsewhere. Emergency loans cannot exceed the actual loss and are capped at \$500,000 per loan. The interest rate is 4.5 percent. To qualify, the farmer must have a 30-percent or greater loss; be a family-size farm operator; be unable to get credit elsewhere; and have federal crop insurance, if available, on the damaged crop.

Haying and Grazing on FmHA Inventory Property—The Farmers Home Administration will sell hay at reasonable cost and take bids for grazing on its inventory property in counties where the state ASCS committee has authorized release of ACR and CU acreage for haying and grazing.

1989 USDA Drought Task Force—Chaired by USDA Under Secretary for International Affairs and Commodity Programs Richard T. Crowder, members include heads of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, Farmers Home Administration, Federal Crop Insurance Corp., World Agricultural Outlook Board, Economic Research Service, Soil Conservation Service, Forest Service, the Office of Intergovernmental Affairs, and other key USDA officials. The Task Force meets at least weekly, and more often when needed to closely monitor the weather, crop and livestock conditions.

Kelly Shipp (202) 447-4623

Revised: June 2, 1989

#

